REMARKS

This is in response to the non-final Office Action dated December 12, 2007. For at least the reasons stated below, Applicants submit that all claims are patentable in view of the prior art of record.

Applicants amend claims 1, 26, 29, 32-35 and 39-44. These amendments do not add any new matter beyond the specification as originally filed. Claims 1, 29 and 39-44 have been amended to include clarifying language, as well as the additional step of resolving the script URLs based on the execution, consistent with the preamble. Accordingly, Applicants request entrance and examination.

Claims 1-9, 11-25 and 40-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As understood, the Examiner asserts these claims as failing to lack any useful, concrete and tangible result. This position is estimated based on omission of specific discussions, and is inferred from the mere recitation of passages of form paragraphs. Applicants amend the pending claims to include the additional step of resolving the script URLs, which thereby provides the useful, concrete and tangible result of the resolved script URLs. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal. Should the Examiner maintain the present rejection, Applicants request a further indication as to why these claims are deemed to be directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The specification is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) based on the Examiner's assertion of the omission of the discussion of a "computer readable medium." Applicants respectfully disagree for two distinct reasons. First, 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 requires that the specification "contain a written description of the invention" in a manner to "enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains" to carry out such invention. One skilled in the art to which

the disclosure relates would know the term "computer readable medium" and accordingly this element is within the disclosure under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1. Second, making the first point moot, computer readable medium is described in the specification at ¶ 0064 beginning on page 11 of the specification. Accordingly, this objection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 15-27and 29-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0052928 ("Stern") in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0147637 ("Kraft") in further view of U.S. Published Application No. 2003/0084034 ("Fannin"). Claims 4 and 14 are further rejected based on the additional combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,424,966.

Applicants note the Response to Arguments section and appreciate the Examiner's detailed response. Applicants must respectfully traverse and disagree, including specifically the definition and subsequent positions regarding "dynamically create one or more script URLs." For example, on page 3, the Applicants submit that a dynamically created "script URL" is not a "web page/web browser that is created by the script code", but rather is a URL that is dynamically created by the execution of the script code. As claimed herein, the execution of the script code provides for the dynamic creation of the URL and the URL is not discernable without the script code execution.

Applicants have previously argued and seek to further clarify here that Stern fails to teach or suggest the claimed script URLs. The Examiner's argument overlooks the clear and explicit language of Stern which states in ¶ 0115 on lines 8-11, which state: "A simpler approach though that this invention implements is to extract from the scrip anything that looks like a URL, without the need to understand or parse "correctly" the script."

The Examiner's position in the paragraph extending from Page 3 to 4 of the present Office Action is improper, and accordingly the overall rejection is improper. The Examiner's position is that Stern teaches : (1) a web page that has script code; and (2) the web page itself is not made out of static HTML. The Examiner's position is that a "constructed link or URL" has already been embedded in the web page disclosed by Stern because Stern has script code.

The Examiner's position overlooks the exact language of a script URL and the claimed limitations associated therewith. The script URL is **dynamically** created when the script code is executed, in other words, the script URL is not readily identifiable from the script code itself. Even taking the above-noted 2 Examiner points, Stern's web page with script code and the page, when loaded, is dynamically created, still fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations relating to script URLs because Stern describes not executing the script code, but rather extracts anything that looks a URL, where these are completely different.

Regardless thereof, Applicants further submit that the combination of Stern, Kraft and Fannin are silent regarding the additionally claimed limitation of "resolving the script URLs based on the execution." For example, Stern is unable to teach or suggest this because Stern expressly avoids the execution of the script itself and would thus be unable to perform a resolving step as claimed.

For at least all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections, and allowance of all the pending claims is respectfully solicited. To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' undersigned representative to discuss any issues relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 15, 2008

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING SYSTEM ON February 15, 2008.

Timothy J. Bechen
Reg. No. 48,126
DREIER LLP
499 Park Ave.
New York, New York 10022
Tel : (212) 328-6100
Fax: (212) 328-6101

Customer No. 61834